

Serial No. 10/784,759  
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2005

Docket No. IK-0079

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached drawings include changes to Fig. 10a and new Fig. 10c. The sheet that include Figs. 10a-10b, replaces the original sheet including Figs.10a-10b. In Figure 10a, previously omitted element 400b has been added. New Fig. 10c shows the latch 120 can be mounted in a second body 410'.

Attachment: Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-3, 5-25 and 27-33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 19, 21, 24, 29 and 32, the specification and Fig. 10a are amended and Fig. 10c is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. No new matter is added by this Amendment.

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

Applicant sincerely acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 1-3, 5-21 and 27-32 define patentable subject matter. However, for at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

A. The Office Action objects to claims 19, 21, 24, 29 and 32. Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments obviate the grounds for the objection. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 19, 21, 24, 29 and 32 is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action objects to the drawings and indicates the drawings must show a display surface and keyboard on a second body. Applicant respectfully submits that the Annotated Sheet Showing Changes to Fig. 10a adds element 400b as a input device such as a

keyboard to second body 410. Further, Applicant respectfully submits display surface 400b is illustrated in Fig. 10b as a portion of first body 400. New Fig. 10c shows the latch 120 can be mounted in a second body 410'. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 27 and 28 recite that a latch such as latch 120 can be mounted in a first body in a display unit or a main body.

The Office Action further indicates a passage hole incline surface must be shown in the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that in one embodiment a passage hole is formed by casing 100 placed in a through hole of a first or second body. The casing 100 includes a catching portion 106 that forms a surface of the passage hole. As shown in at least Figs. 7 and 9a, Applicant respectfully submits that an end 106a includes an incline surface 106a'. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits features recited in claim 13 are shown in the drawings.

Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

C. The Office Action rejects claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments obviate the grounds for the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 under §112 is respectfully requested.

D. The Office Action rejects claims 22-23 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,707,665 to Hsu et al. (hereafter "Hsu"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that Hsu does not disclose recited features as required under §102. For example, Hsu does not disclose at least features

of a method of latching a portable computer including moving the first body to the second closed position and pressing the first engagement protrusion to latch a second engagement protrusion of the bi-directional latch in the engagement catch, wherein the first and second engagement protrusions extend from opposite sides of the first body and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23.

In contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that Hsu discloses pressing a hook controlling member 41 in order to move an engaging end 423, 424, respectively. See Figs. 2-3 and column 3, lines 49-59 and column 4, lines 10-13, a hook-controlling member recited in claim 1 of Hsu.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that as shown in Figs. 6 and 8 of Hsu that an incline slot 421 includes two horizontal positions at opposing ends thereof corresponding to the first and second transverse positions. Further, the first and second engaging ends 423, 424 has specific dimensions in coordination with first slot 316, second slot 317 and intermediate slot 432. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a force on engaging end 423 or 424 would be in a vertical direction would not move hook member 42 or hook controlling member 41 with button 412 because of the force on a pushing rod 413 would occur in a horizontal position of the incline slot 421. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Hsu itself discloses the hook-controlling member 41 moving the hook member 42 between a first and second transverse positions. See at least column 3, lines 55-59; column 4, lines 10-14 and claims 1 and 5 of Hsu.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Hsu does not teach or suggest any modification to its disclosure that would result in at least features of pressing the first engagement protrusion to latch a second engagement protrusion of the bi-directional latch in the engagement catch, wherein the first and second engagement protrusions extend from opposite sides of the first body and combinations thereof as recited in claim 23.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 23 defines patentable subject matter. Claim 22 defines patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 23. Claim 33 depends from claim 23 and therefore defines patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as its additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-23 and 33 under §102 is respectfully requested.

E. The Office Action rejects claims 24-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Hsu and U.S. Patent No. 6,068,307 to Murphy. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action asserts using a closure system of Murphy would benefit the system of Hsu in that it would reduce a number of working parts and therefore reduce the chances of a system failing or operating incorrectly. Further, such a modification would be less costly and easier to assemble a latching system comprising less parts. See Item 5, page 8, lines 6-9 of the Office Action.

In contrast, Applicant respectfully submits that Hsu discloses first/second engaging ends 423 engaging a main body 2. See Figs. 9-12 of Hsu. Therefore, Hsu discloses no features other than the main body 2 in a recess of the main body 2. In contrast, Applicant respectfully

submits Murphy discloses a significant plurality of parts in order to ensure that the locking mechanism in a second member 306 cannot engage unless a stylus 320 is inserted in a stylus channel 322. See Figs. 10-12 of Murphy.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there would be no motivation to combine the closure system of Murphy with Hsu in that it would increase the number of working parts. Further, the chances of the system of Hsu failing or operating incorrectly would increase with modifications as asserted by the Office Action. Also, it would be more costly to assemble such a latching system. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits Hsu and/or Murphy, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest such a modification asserted in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits improper hindsight was used in the rejection of claims 24-25.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 24 defines patentable subject matter. Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and therefore also defines patentable subject matter for at least that reason as well as its additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24-25 under §103 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carl R. Wesolowski**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski  
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/CRW:jld:rlg  
**Date: September 21, 2005**  
\\fk4\Documents\2047\2047-076\72503.doc